

REMARKS

This request for reconsideration is submitted in response to the Office Action of September 30, 2008.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Brown reference (WO 93/04559). Similarly, the Office Action rejected Claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Gros reference (EP 0 810 780 A1) and rejected Claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Thomsen reference (WO 98/43231).

The Office Action argues that the Brown reference discloses a method of depicting an image including applying it to a surface. The Office Action further argues that Brown discloses creating the image by applying an inverse perspective transformation of the image to a surface. However, it is respectfully submitted that the method of the presently claimed invention is quite different from the method disclosed in the Brown reference in that the presently claimed invention includes:

projecting the predefined surface area to a plane perpendicular to a line of sight between a predefined viewpoint and said print carrier,

placing the advertisement information within boundaries of said projected predefined surface area (101),

generating said advertisement print by transforming (201, 203, 205, 207) the projected predefined surface area together with the advertisement information to an area similar to said predefined surface area of said substantially plane print carrier.

Examples of the method steps are illustrated in Figure 1b, wherein element 101 is the predefined surface area with the same dimensions as the print carrier where the print is to be placed. After the designer has decided how the advertisement print should be visualized, the predefined surface area with the graphical design on it is transformed to an area similar to the predefined surface area, but rectangular in shape and placed in a horizontal line, e.g. in the line of the paper. This means that the advertisement print, e.g., the graphical design, is stretched and tilted, but when placed on the print carrier, the print will be visualized the way the designer intended it to be visualized.

This is a novel and unobvious way of implanting the inverse perspective transformation in connection with creating an image which gives a lot of advantages, both in the process of making the image and in the final product as described above.

In contrast, the Brown reference does not disclose an inclined surface, as argued by the Office Action. The Brown reference does disclose a ground surface on page 3, line 21, and that the surface may be a playing surface or field for a sporting event on page 3, lines 1-2. Although it is colorable that some kind of incline can be present on a ground surface, it is not anticipated that there is, particularly on a playing field for conventional sports. Therefore, the use of a predefined inclined surface is novel and unobvious.

Similarly, the Gros reference discloses a method comprising measuring the angle between the advertising panel receiving the advertisement and the image-capturing camera and plotting the individual segments of the advertising panel according to the angular transformation onto a plan perpendicular to a selected axis resulting from a projection of the advertising panel. Again, it is respectfully submitted that the presently claimed invention uses a different method of depicting an image.

As the Office Action states, the Gros reference teaches transforming the advertisement to create an image (col. 5, lines 6-29), but the method used for that transformation is different from the method of the presently claimed invention. The Office Action further argues that the creation of a print is disclosed in col. 4, lines 45-53 of the Gros reference. However, this is respectfully traversed. What is taught in the cited passage is how different materials, such as simple fabrics, can be spread horizontally on the ground, without the need for support, which is irrelevant to the presently claimed invention.

With respect to the Thomsen reference, the Office Action argues that the creation of a print is disclosed on page 2, lines 28-32. However, this is likewise respectfully traversed. What is disclosed in this citation is how to apply the print to the plane print carrier, but not how the print itself is created. Again, the applicants respectfully submit that no method of generating a print is disclosed in this reference.

The figurative elements disclosed on page 4, lines 22-28 of the Thomsen reference refer to the individual letters and pictures on the print and how the angles of the pictures could be implemented when the designer designs the print. However, it is unnecessary to discuss different angles of the individual figurative elements with respect to the presently claimed method of generating a print, because the designer does not have to visualize how the print is going to be implemented, but simply draw how the designer wishes the print to be perceived or visualized, when the print is in place.

The Office Action notes on page 4, line 32 to page 5, line 2 of the Thomsen reference, that the plane print carrier could be a ground surface such as a lawn, a road, a parking lot, a front of a house or a side of a bus. Although some sort of incline may occur in these places, it is not anticipated, therefore the use a predefined inclined surface is novel and unobvious.

Furthermore, as stated in the Request for Reconsideration dated June 16, 2008, Claims 6, 16 and 25 relate to various apparatus including advertisement information printed on an inclined surface on a print carrier, the print comprises a perspective projection of at three-dimensional element, where the perspective projection is based on a predefined viewpoint. This generates a virtual space on the advertisement print (an image) which first of all gives a more powerful advertisement, but also results in an advertisement print that can be used for a larger variety of advertising purposes taking advantage of a virtual space. This is not disclosed in the cited prior art.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that these rejections are overcome.

For all of the reasons above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are in immediate condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections of the claims, to allow the claims, and to pass this application to early issue.

Respectfully submitted;



Gerald Levy
Registration No. 24,419

Ronald E. Brown
Registration No. 32,200

Day Pitney LLP
7 Times Square
New York, New York 10036-7311
212-297-5800